UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,981	01/11/2002	Oleg Wasynczuk	16410-112	8469

7590 08/18/2005

Woodard, Emhardt, Naughton, Moriarty and McNett
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

EXAMINER	
SILVER, DAVID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/043,981	WASYNCZUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Silver	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/11/02.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-15-02.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted on April 15, 2002 has been considered by the Examiner.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged and granted.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 5 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

a. As per claim 5, the Examiner asserts that claim 4 has already met the entire limitation of claim 5. Claim 4 teaches of a regeneration of a state equation upon a topological change event. Claim 5 discloses a regeneration of a sub-set of state equation upon a topological change event. It is inherent that upon a sub-set regeneration in effect the entire set is regenerated. For example, the superset {{a}, {b}, {c}} regenerates sub-set {c} which becomes {c1}. As such, the entire superset can be said to have regenerated to become {{a}, {b}, {c1}} since it is no longer identical to the previous superset.

Therefore, claim 5 fails to further limit claim 4.

b. Claims 9-10 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if rewritten to overcome the 101 and 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 8 recites the limitation "B^{CA}_{link}" in line 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

i. MPEP 2171 reads as follows:
ii. Two Separate Requirements for Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph
iii. The second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is directed to requirements for the claims:
iv. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. There are two separate requirements set forth in this paragraph:
v. the claims must set forth the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention; and
vi. **the claims must particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant.**

7. Specifically, claim 15 fails to explain how it is possible to have a **maximum or minimum of an element**. Further, claim 15 fails to explain the properly the phrase "negative of the minimum of all controlling elements" The Examiner asserts that the Applicant fails to define metes and bounds for the maximum and minimum of the mentioned element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

MPEP 2111 [R-1] *recites the following:*

> *"2111 [R-1] Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation*
> CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE
>
> INTERPRETATION
> *During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000).< Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969) (Claim 9 was directed to a process of analyzing data generated by mass spectrographic analysis of a gas. The process comprised selecting the data to be analyzed by subjecting the data to a mathematical manipulation. The examiner made rejections under **35 U.S.C. 101** and 102. In the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection, the examiner explained that **the claim was anticipated by a mental process augmented by pencil and paper markings**. **The court agreed that the claim was not limited to using a machine to carry out the process since the claim did not explicitly set forth the machine**. The court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.). See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO*

applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification.")"

8. The language of claim 8-10 raises a question as to whether the claims are directed to an abstract idea, mere manipulation of mathematical functions, or the practical application of the idea in the technological arts so as to provide a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In particular, it is unclear if either the calculation or simulation utilize a machine to accomplish the recited steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2131.01 Multiple Reference 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections
Normally, only one reference should be used in making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. However, **a 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection over multiple references has been held to be proper when the extra references** are cited to:
(A) Prove the primary reference contains an "enabled disclosure;"
(B) Explain the meaning of a term used in the primary reference; or
(C) **Show that a characteristic not disclosed in the reference is inherent.**

10. Claims 1-7, 11, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by TINA Pro.

a. As per claim 1, the reference implements a method, comprising:

creating one or more data structures sufficient to model an electronic circuit as a collection of n elements consisting of:

zero or more LRV elements, each having at least one of

(a) a non-zero inductance parameter L_{br}, (b) a non-zero resistance parameter r_{br}, or (c) a non-zero voltage source parameter e_{br},**("Electronic Components in TINA" hereinafter referred to as "ECTINA": Passive Components: Inductor, Resistor, Sources: Voltage Source. Example of said modeling can be seen in the image on page "Symbolic Circuit Analysis")**, but **neither** a non-zero capacitance parameter, nor a non-zero current source parameter, nor a switch parameter **(ECTINA: Passive Components: Capacitor, Sources: Current Source, Other: voltage controlled switch)**;

zero or more CRI elements, each having at least one of

(a) a non-zero capacitance parameter C_{br}, (b) a non-zero resistance parameter r_{br}, or (c) a non-zero current source parameter j_{br},**(ECTINA: Passive Components: Capacitor, Resistor, Sources: Current Source)**, but neither a non-zero inductance parameter, nor a non-zero voltage source parameter, nor a switch parameter **(ECTINA: Passive Components: Inductor, Sources: Voltage Source, Other: voltage controlled switch)**;

and zero or more switching elements, each having a switch state **(ECTINA: Other Components: time controlled switch, voltage controlled switch, Flip-flops)** and

neither a non-zero inductance parameter, a non-zero capacitance parameter, a non-zero resistance parameter, a non-zero voltage source parameter, nor a non-zero current source parameter **(See Examiner notes below on component characteristics and modification)**;

and automatically generating a first set of state equations from said one or more data structures **("Symbolic Circuit Analysis" hereinafter referred to as "SCATINA" lines 1-2)**;

and simulating operation of the electronic circuit by application of said first set of state equations **(See Examiner assertion 2 below)**;

wherein n is at least two, and the collection comprises either

an LRV element for which at least two of L_{br}, r_{br}, or e.sub.br are non-zero, or a CRI element for which at least two of C_{br}, r_{br}, or j_{br} are non-zero **(See Examiner note and assertion 1 below)**.

Note: The components of TINA Pro can work in either ideal mode where all characteristics are set to zero, or the user is able to specify which parameters to add to the simulation (i.e., a voltage sources having associated resistance) (ECTINA, line 1-2 "which can be modified by the user").

Assertion 1: The Examiner also asserts the creation of the mentioned circuit can be manually done by the user. As such, the parameters can be entered by the user. Additionally, the user can place as many

components into the computer aided design program as he or she wishes, which includes 2 or more of the above-mentioned components.

Assertion 2: The Examiner asserts that the claim limitation does **not** limit the simulation to take place within a computer system. Therefore, a user of the equations can perform the said simulation.

b. As per claim 2, the reference implements a method of claim 1, wherein said simulating comprises

producing state output, data, the method further comprising **("Circuit Simulation" hereinafter referred to as "CSTINA" lines 1-2 and figure)**:

modifying the parameters in said first set of state equations as a function of said state output data **(ECTINA, Flip-flops, See assertion below)**.

The Examiner asserts that in order for D flip-flop simulation to occur the simulator inherently uses the output of the flip-flop to feedback into the input of the flip-flop (in case of a feedback loop) and as such the simulator modified the parameters of the said first equation as a function of the output.

c. As per claim 3, the reference implements a method of claim 1, further comprising:

modifying the parameters in said first set of state equations based on a time-varying parameter of at least one element in said collection **(ECTINA: Other components: time controlled switch)**.

d. As per claim 4, the reference implements a method of claim 1, further comprising:

generating a second set of state equations from said one or more data structures upon the occurrence of a first topology change event **(ECTINA: Other components: time controlled switch)**.

The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that TINA generates a new equation upon a topological change, such as that of a switch change, in order to continue producing valid results within accordance of the new circuit configuration.

e. As per claim 5, the reference implements a method of claim 4, wherein said generating said second set of state equations comprises

modifying only the subset of said first set of state equations that depend on the one or more switching elements that have changed **(ECTINA: Other components: time controlled switch)**.

The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that TINA generates a new equation upon a topological change, such as that of a switch change, in order to continue producing valid results within accordance of the new circuit configuration. The Examiner asserts that this claim fails to further limit claim 4 and as such was objected to in section "Claim Objections".

f. As per claim 6, the reference implements a method of claim 4, wherein each unique vector of switch states represents a topology of the overall circuit, and further comprising:

storing said first set of state equations in a cache; after a second topology change event, determining whether a set of state equations in the cache represents the new topology; if said determining is answered in the affirmative, using the set of state equations that represents the new topology to simulate operation of the circuit after the second topology change event; and if said determining is answered in the negative, building a third set of state equations that represents the new topology, **and** using the third set of state equations to simulate operation of the circuit after the second topology change event **("TINA: Toolkit for Interactive Network Analysis" hereinafter referred to as "Frontpage", lines 1-2)**.

The Examiner asserts that the caching mechanism is inherently incorporated into the TINA application. TINA runs on Microsoft ® Windows ® which has a caching mechanism built into it. Additionally, all modern processors for example Pentium 4 and AMD Athlon contain a caching mechanism such that when an instruction is frequently used it will not be re-generated and when a new instruction is required it will be fetched from non-cached areas. As such, when a new topology is generated the processor will see that the instruction set is identical to that

of its cached copy and will execute the cached equations. In the event that the instructions are not in cache the processor will execute generated. For an example of **cache** in all modern processors see "How Computers Work" non-patent literature reference enclosed.

g. As per claim 7, the reference implements a method of claim 6, further comprising:

storing said second set of state equations in a cache; after a third topology change event, deciding whether a set of state equations in the cache represents the new topology; if said deciding is concluded in the affirmative, using the set of state equations from the cache that represents the new topology to simulate operation of the circuit after the third topology change event; and if said deciding is concluded in the negative, building a new set of state equations that represents the new topology, and using the new set of state equations to simulate operation of the circuit after the third topology change event **("TINA: Toolkit for Interactive Network Analysis" hereinafter referred to as "Frontpage", lines 1-2)**.

This claim is rejected under same assertion as claim 6.

h. As per claim 11, the reference implements a system, comprising

i. a processor and a computer-readable medium in communication with said processor **(Frontpage, "The Complete Electronics Lab for Windows" TINA is an application designed to run on Windows, as**

such it inherently requires a processor and memory in communication with the processor),

ii. said medium containing programming instructions executable by said processor to:

(1) build state equations for a first topology of an electronic circuit having at least two switching elements, wherein each switching element has a switching state **(ECTINA time controlled switch. It is inherent that TINA has instructions to be executed by the processor to add components including, but not limiting to time an voltage controlled switching elements.)**

(2) solve said state equations at time t_i to provide a state output vector, in which at least two elements control the switching states of the switching elements **(CSTINA: The image shows an output vector (graph) as a time t_i, displayed on the x-axis. The output vector can be referring to the output of the said equations on a graph at a particular time. Therefore, at time 0, the output vector is <collector, base> is <13mV, 2mV> and at time 100mS it is <-5mV, 0mV> as shown in the figure displayed on page CSTINA);**

(3) calculate the value of a switching variable as a function of the state output vector, wherein the value reflects whether the

switching state of at least one of the switching elements is changing **(ECTINA: Flip-flop, See Examiner assertions below)**;

(4) and if the value of the switching variable at time t_i indicates that at least one of the switching elements is changing, determine a second topology of the electronic circuit for time t_i^+ and obtain state equations for the second topology **(ECTINA: Other components: time controlled switch, See Examiner assertion 1)**.

Assertion 1: The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that TINA generates a new equation upon a topological change, such as that of a switch change, in order to continue producing valid results within accordance of the new circuit configuration.

Assertion 2: The Examiner asserts that in order for D flip-flop simulation to occur the simulator inherently uses the output of the flip-flop to feedback into the input of the flip-flop (in case of a feedback loop) and as such the simulator modified the parameters of the said first equation as a function of the output.

Assertion 3: The Examiner asserts that the switching variable can be merely a Boolean function wherein if one switch is changing its value the Boolean will be, for example, "true" to reflect that a change has occurred, and "false" if no change has occurred.

i. As per claim 16, the reference implements a system for simulating electronic circuits, comprising a processor and a computer-readable medium in

communication with said processor, said medium containing programming instructions executable by said processor to read element parameters and node connection information from a data stream comprising at least one switch type specification, the at least one switch type specification being selected from the group consisting of:

a unidirectional, unlatched switch ;a bidirectional, unlatched switch; a unidirectional, latched switch; and a bidirectional, latched switch **(ECTINA: Flip-flops: D latch)**;

and wherein said instructions are further executable by said processor automatically to calculate state equations for the circuit given the states of switches specified by said at least one switch type specification **(SCATINA lines 1-2 and displayed image. It is inherent that instructions are executed by the said processor to calculate the state equation for the given switches)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TINA as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of MathWorks (http://web.archive.org/web/20010309234347/http://web.ccr.jussieu.fr/ccr/Documentation/Calcul/matlab5v11/docs/00000/0007e.htm, 1997) (hereinafter "MathWorks") (See PTO-892 for reference information).

j. As per claim 12, TINA teaches of system which includes instructions to solve and build state equations and resolve switching logic. As such it must have block of code (modules) to accomplish the mentioned tasks. TINA does not however explicitly disclose using an ordinary differential equation solver module. However, MathWorks teaches of an exemplary analogous simulation system using such ODE solvers, as stated on page "SIMULINK 2; Simulation Engine" section "New ODE Solvers". It is inherent that such a system which includes an ODE solver. Additionally, it is inherent that the building, solving, and determining are performed by their respective modules.

k. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of simulation, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings and implementations of the references. In fact, motivation to combine would have been to create a faster and more powerful circuit simulation engine and, for example, to include non-linear components such as transistors and RLC circuits.

l. As per claim 13, the reference discloses a system of claim 12, wherein said obtaining is performed by said switching logic module **(ECTINA: Other: time/voltage controlled switch)**.

The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that TINA uses at least switching logic code (module), and likely other modules, in order to simulate a circuit containing one or more switching components such as the ones referenced above.

m. As per claim 14, the reference discloses a system of claim 12, wherein said obtaining is performed by said state equation building module **(ECTINA: Other: time/voltage controlled switch)**.

The Examiner asserts that it is inherent for TINA to use at least state equation building code (module), and likely other modules, in order to display the circuit equation as shown in webpage SCATINA image titled "bandpass".

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 101 and 112 rejections.

14. As per claim 8, the following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. The instant application is directed to a non-obvious improvement over the computer application as implemented in TINA Pro.

The improvement comprises method, comprising: creating one or more data structures that together store characteristics of a plurality of active branches B^{active} that make up a graph of nodes and branches that form a circuit, wherein B^{active} consists of a set B_L of zero or more inductive branches, each having a non-zero inductive component but neither a capacitive component nor a variable switch state; a set B^C of zero or more capacitive branches, each having a non-zero capacitive component but neither an inductive component nor a variable switch state; and a set B^A of additional branches, each having neither an inductive component, nor a capacitive component; partitioning B^{active} into a first branch set B.sub.tree.sup.active and a second branch set B.sub.link.sup.active, where the branches in B.sub.tree.sup.active form a spanning tree over B^{active}, giving priority in said partitioning to branches not in B^L over branches in B.sup.L; sub-partitioning B.sub.link.sup.active into a third branch set B.sub.link.sup.L and a fourth branch set B.sub.link.sup.CA, where B.sub.link.sup.L=B.sub.link.sup.active.andgate.B.sup.L; identifying a fifth branch set B.sup.CA as the union of B.sub.link.sup.CA, B.sup.C.andgate.B.sub.tree.sup.active, and those branches in B.sub.tree.sup.active that form a closed graph when combined with B.sub.link.sup.CA; partitioning B.sup.CA into a sixth branch set {tilde over

(B)}.sub.tree.sup.CA and a seventh branch set {tilde over (B)}.sub.link.sup.CA, where the branches in {tilde over (B)}.sub.tree.sup.CA form a spanning tree over B^{CA}, giving priority in said partitioning to branches in B^{C} over branches not in B^{C}; identifying an eighth branch set B.sub.tree.sup.C={tilde over (B)}.sub.tree.sup.CA.andgate.B.sup.C; selecting a set of state variables comprising: for each branch of B.sub.link.sup.L, either the inductor current or inductor flux, and for each branch of B.sub.tree.sup.C, either the capacitor voltage or capacitor charge; and simulating a plurality of states of the circuit using the set of state variables.

The art of record, either individually or in combination, fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious the useful, concrete and tangible <simulation of circuit> having the corresponding function which is disclosed in the specification and equivalents thereof at least at page 5-6. In view of the foregoing, the claims of the present application are found to be patentable over the prior ad.

15. As per claim 15, the following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. The instant application is directed to a non-obvious improvement over the computer application as implemented in TINA Pro.

The improvement comprises a comprising a processor and a computer-readable medium in communication with said processor, said medium containing programming instructions executable by said processor to: build state equations for a first topology of an electronic circuit having at least two switching elements, wherein each switching element has a switching state; solve said state equations at time t_i to provide a state

output vector, in which at least two elements control the switching states of the switching elements; calculate the value of a switching variable as a function of the state output vector, wherein the value reflects whether the switching state of at least one of the switching elements is changing; and if the value of the switching variable at time t_i indicates that at least one of the switching elements is changing, determine a second topology of the electronic circuit for time t_i^+ and obtain state equations for the second topology.

And wherein the said improvement wherein said programming instructions comprise a state equation building module, a solver module for ordinary differential equations, and a switching logic module; said building is performed by the state equation building module; said solving and calculating are performed by the solver module; and said determining is performed by the switching logic module.

And wherein at a time t_j, at least two switching elements are each either rising-sensitive or falling-sensitive switches, wherein rising-sensitive switches change switching state if and only if a controlling element of the state vector has passed from a negative value to a non-negative value; and falling-sensitive switches change switching state if and only if a controlling element of the state vector has passed from a positive value to a non-positive value; and the function for detecting the change in circuit topology is defined by: determining the maximum, absolute, voltage magnitude of

a. (1) the highest output voltage of an output vector and

b. (2) the lowest of the output voltage of an output vector;

wherein, the output vector consisting of the output of either a rising/positive edge triggered switch or falling/negative edge triggered switch wherein the switches are biased to toggle at 0V.

These patentable distinctions are included in dependent claim no 15. The art of record, either individually or in combination, fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious the useful, concrete and tangible <simulation of circuit> having the corresponding function which is disclosed in the specification and equivalents thereof at least at page 7, lines 17-23 through page 16, lines 15, and Figures 1-8. In view of the foregoing, the claims of the present application are found to be patentable over the prior ad.

Conclusion

16. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to David Silver whose telephone number is (571) 272-8634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere can be reached on (571)272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Silver
Examiner
Art Unit 2128